K7FKCHEC	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	-x
NITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
V.	19 CR 833 (SHS)
NTHONY CHEEDIE,	
Defendant.	
	-x
	New York, N.Y. July 15, 2020 3:40 p.m.
Before:	
HON. SIDN	NEY H. STEIN,
	District Judge
A DDG	IADANGEG
	EARANCES
AUDREY STRAUSS Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York BENET KEARNEY	
Assistant United States A	Attorney
FREDERICK LAWRENCE SOSINSKY ANASTASIOS SARIKAS	
Attorneys for Defendant	
LLSO PRESENT:	
OHAMMED AHMED, Pretrial Servi	ces (By Speakerphone)

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Case called) 2 MS. KEARNEY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Benet

3 Kearney, for the United States.

> MR. SOSINSKY: For Mr. Cheedie, Fred Sosinksy, and I am joined by my colleague, Anastasios Sarikas, as well.

> > MR. SARIKAS: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

Mr. Cheedie is present; is that correct?

MR. SOSINSKY: Yes, Judge, standing between us.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: And Mr. Ahmed?

MR. AHMED: Yes.

THE COURT: Make your appearance, sir. You're

Mr. Ahmed from pretrial services, correct?

MR. AHMED: Good afternoon, Judge. Mohammed Ahmed, on behalf of pretrial services.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

Good afternoon, everyone. These are strange days. Everybody in the courtroom is masked. I just took my mask off, there's nobody near me, and it's easier to speak, but I

appreciate everyone being here.

There are two purposes for our conference today. One is to act on the request for a bail review by pretrial services, and Mr. Ahmed could not make it in, and I appreciate his being on the phone. And I take this as a very serious issue. There are a number of people in the courtroom who I

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

take it are here in support of Mr. Cheedie, in addition to the lawyers, and the court reporter, and my clerks, and my deputy.

The second is to have a Curcio hearing to see if $\mbox{Mr.}$ Cheedie understands the potential conflict or not, and I will explain that.

But I'm going to start with the request for a bail review.

Now, Mr. Cheedie -- and I will hear from either of the lawyers or both of the lawyers.

Mr. Cheedie, perhaps you were misled by the fact that I believe all of the defendants in this case are not incarcerated; in other words, no one has been incarcerated.

Is that right, Ms. Kearney?

MS. KEARNEY: That's correct. No one is incarcerated, that's correct.

THE COURT: So maybe you thought in these cases, people just aren't incarcerated. You're wrong. That's point one.

Point two is, things like this, normally I give people one strike, I think that that's appropriate, and now you have two strikes. And at the end of my presentation, I'm going to ask you — first your lawyer, if he wants to speak — if you can give me a single reason why you shouldn't be incarcerated. I'm sure your lawyer will come up with a number.

You seem to have a problem -- and, again, I'll let you

speak. I'm just giving you my view after having read these
papers. The problem with the problem that is, your problem
is with alcohol. The problem with the problem is that you're
putting other people at risk. I certainly would have no
interest in you hurting yourself while driving drunk or under
the influence of alcohol I certainly don't want that to
happen but I have a responsibility to make sure it doesn't
happen to other people, and you're putting them at risk, and
have twice or have at least twice. I don't want to incarcerate
you, especially in this time of COVID. I've been dealing each
day with a number of requests for compassionate release. This
is my first day in the courthouse in quite a while. I do it
while working remotely, because, not surprisingly, those who
are incarcerated would rather be anywhere else than
incarcerated. That makes sense, people are rational, but
especially at this time, where if you get COVID in a jail,
under pretrial detention, it makes it even worse.

So, here, I have a strong incentive not to incarcerate you. And you have no history of violence or anything like that -- you're not going to flee, that's not an issue -- but what is at issue is the possibility, or likelihood, or potential for you to kill somebody in a car who's not yourself. It happens all the time. And you were given one strike.

Here's the information I think I know:

Back in November of last year, you were arrested on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

these charges, conspiracy to commit wire fraud, and, as I think you know, I told you I'm quite familiar with the general complex of fraudsters here because I have presided over a trial in a related matter that's now over. You weren't incarcerated, you were let out on bail, and still are. And shortly thereafter, in February of this year, you were arrested in Little Falls for driving while intoxicated, refusing to cooperate, reckless driving, leaving the scene, no insurance, no seatbelt. It doesn't make any sense at all, I mean, for somebody to do that. It doesn't make any sense for somebody to drive while intoxicated. It doesn't make any sense for somebody to refuse the assistance of law enforcement. It doesn't make any sense, unless you're under the influence of alcohol, to leave the scene. It certainly doesn't make any sense, whether you have been drinking or not, to have no insurance while driving and not to be using a seatbelt. Those are the accusations, as I remember.

Pretrial let me know about that. They also said they didn't think any action was needed by me, except that you were going to go to outpatient alcohol treatment. That made sense. You know, we don't come down hard on somebody when they've, quote, made a mistake, end quote, although I could have incarcerated you at that time. You then asked, as it were, a favor or special attention, a special action by the Court, which, again, I was pleased, happy, to give you; you were going

to go to Sharon, Connecticut, I think, to be with your inlaws, and then I extended, so you were there for one month. Again, happy to do it, it made sense.

While there, you were arrested by the Sharon police. Your car had been damaged. You were under the influence to some extent with alcohol, presumably. You had been in the hit-and-run accident; they found that out pretty quickly. It didn't take a genius to know that the car was damaged, and the hit-and-run had been called in, or was about to be called in. According to the police report, you were slow in your speech, you were confused, you gave conflicting answers as to what you were doing. Apparently, you said you were getting parts for your pool, you were getting dinner for your wife. You were charged with operating under the influence, you refused to leave the car, you seemed to give the police a hard time.

I need to protect the public. I'll ask you a rhetorical question, because you should talk to your lawyer before saying anything -- anything you say can be used against you -- but the rhetorical question is, why shouldn't I revoke your bail?

Mr. Sosinksy, what would you like to say?

MR. SOSINSKY: Thank you, your Honor.

Would you like me to wear the mask, or may I --

THE COURT: I guess that's up to Ms. Kearney, who's

sitting in front of you.

MR. SOSINSKY: I'm happy to move back and keep my voice up, if I could.

MS. KEARNEY: I have the antibodies.

MR. SOSINSKY: She has the antibodies.

THE COURT: We don't know what that means, sir. We don't know what that means. And I just read an article that they have found that these antibodies of COVID have a surprisingly short half-life. Since I don't know what that means either, I'm okay. Why don't you go over there.

MR. SOSINSKY: Judge, what you may not know -- I suppose you wouldn't know -- is that following the first of the two incidents that your Honor made mention of, Mr. Cheedie, not at my urging, really, but at his own, looked into and had made arrangements to enter into an extended drug and alcohol rehabilitation in-person program in Pennsylvania, and we were preparing to ask the Court about it literally as the COVID shutdown began.

I mention that -- you have the name, in fact.

Mohammed, of pretrial services, and I both spoke, and I emailed him information. And I think everyone was in agreement at that time that he very much needed inpatient alcohol treatment, if ever he was to be able to understand the underpinnings of what drives him to drinking, which, as the Court, I think, suggested, was really not the issue -- it's certainly not the issue for the Court -- but it's the combination of then getting

into a vehicle and endangering the rest of us, whatever he wants to do to himself, I understand that.

I'm mentioning it because that's where -- I had prepared a letter, because it's out of state, so I would have had to have the Court's permission to allow him to do so at the beginning of March. They didn't have beds because they were shutting down. It made no sense to make the request at that point in time. And what Mr. Cheedie then did, from that point until literally, I think, the day when these events transpired up in Sharon, Massachusetts -- I think your Honor said Connecticut, it's actually Massachusetts --

THE COURT: Sorry.

MR. SOSINSKY: -- is he was in therapy remotely -because that's the only choice that anyone was given, given the
unfortunate circumstances that we all found ourselves in -- not
only with a therapist that he sought out, but also one that
Officer Ahmed had referred him to. He had started treatment
with one, told the therapist that they would need to be
providing regular updates to Mr. Ahmed. Apparently, that
program was not associated or affiliated, hadn't done work with
pretrial services, they were uneasy about how that would all
go, he found another one, and eventually he was twice a week,
over the phone, of course, or by videoconference, getting
counseling from two different sources, again, one of which was
selected or referred to him by Officer Ahmed.

During that whole time -- that is, from the end of February/beginning of March -- through when I got an unfortunate phone call on June 26th, I think it was, from his family, he and I had discussed the fact that he needed inpatient alcohol treatment, although it was my understanding -- and I think it's true -- that he actually forbear from consuming alcohol during those months.

And, by the way, Judge, once I began occasionally to come back to my office mid-/late April, Mr. Cheedie would come into my suite, I would set him up in a conference room, and he would go over the discovery, and then we would talk from a safe distance with masks on. He was being, in my view, at least during that time, responsible, also understanding that when things opened up, he needed to be back -- or he needed to be, finally, I should say, in residential alcohol treatment, not because I said it, because that's where he needed to be for his own sake, so that there wouldn't come a day like this one.

He needs desperately, Judge, to be in alcohol treatment. It needs to be inpatient. I'm not saying this for the purpose of avoiding --

THE COURT: Those programs shut down, is that what you're telling me?

MR. SOSINSKY: Yes.

THE COURT: You're saying he needs inpatient, but you can't get him into it?

MR. SOSINSKY: We can now. In fact, your Honor should know that when this issue arose — and it's a serious one, I am not minimizing, I hope your Honor understands, to any extent what your Honor talked about before. I'm not.

THE COURT: Is inpatient available to him now?

MR. SOSINSKY: Yes, inpatient treatment at Geisinger, which was -- I think it's outside Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania, the Scranton area, a program that I already provided back in February or beginning of March to pretrial. As they had a bed for him two weeks ago, we were debating whether to make an application in the interim because your Honor had said --

THE COURT: What's the bottom line, are you seeking his going into this program?

MR. SOSINSKY: I am seeking the Court's direction that he must — if you're going to allow him to be at liberty on different conditions, of course, that he begins by having to be in residential alcohol treatment with — full details, they've already been provided to Mr. Ahmed, but, yes, that he be there with updates to be provided and that he be there. And that, I think — because alcohol sometimes is treated differently —

THE COURT: How long is the program?

MR. SOSINSKY: Well, they would have an initial program of at least 30 to 60 days, and I think that either there or through a referral, he would be referred to longer term treatment. If this were a drug addiction, I think your

Honor knows that those tend to be -- the inpatient programs tend to be far longer than a month or two, they can run a year, they can run 18 months --

THE COURT: Why are you telling me that? This isn't drug inpatient.

MR. SOSINSKY: My point is I'm not sure, given what we've seen and given what I know about alcohol addiction, given the struggles that he has had, that longer inpatient treatment should not be required or might not be required.

THE COURT: Mr. Ahmed, have you been able to hear this discussion, sir? You're on the telephone.

MR. AHMED: Yes, your Honor, I can hear when your Honor speaks clearly. Unfortunately, when defense counsel speaks, I'm not making out everything that is being said.

THE COURT: All right. I can shorten it and give you the essence of his lengthy speech -- I mean his remarks -- I'm sorry, I don't mean to sound negative -- but they were fulsome.

The reduction of his remarks is: Mr. Cheedie needs inpatient alcohol treatment, and he has located a facility in Pennsylvania for a minimum of 30-day residential program, and he is recommending that.

Do you know this program? And what are your thoughts about that recommendation?

MR. AHMED: I do not know the program, although I have heard of the program back in March from defense counsel and

from Mr. Cheedie. If the treatment is deemed to be appropriate after an intake, then we do not oppose him entering treatment.

THE COURT: When you say "deemed to be appropriate after an intake," you do the intake or the program does the intake?

MR. AHMED: No, your Honor. The program would do the intake, and they would make an assessment to deem what the appropriate level of treatment is.

THE COURT: All right. Just stay on the line, sir.

Who pays for this, Mr. Ahmed? Is this privately paid for? Or I guess let me ask Mr. Sosinksy.

MR. SOSINSKY: Judge, this would be privately paid for through insurance or his family, unfortunately, having to go into whatever reserves they have.

THE COURT: Mr. Ahmed, what Mr. Sosinksy says is it would be paid either through insurance or by the family.

MR. AHMED: Yes, it's my understanding that we would only pay for our contracted providers, and that provider is not a contracted provider with the courts.

MR. SOSINSKY: Judge, I had a lot more to say, just for your Honor's consideration, separate and apart from the program itself, because I think it's important that --

THE COURT: What do you want to tell me? Because I think if he goes into a residential program and successfully completes it, that would be very important for his sake and

from the standpoint of my protecting the public.

MR. SOSINSKY: No doubt about that.

THE COURT: So, is there anything else you wanted to tell me in light of that? In other words -- well, I want to hear from the government, but I'd be inclined to not do what I was intending to do -- let's let that be unsaid -- and, instead, direct him to go into this program, and if he successfully completes it, so much the better, and if he doesn't, he will be back before me.

MR. SOSINSKY: Yes, he will, under very different circumstances, certainly.

But, Judge, I just wanted you to be aware of the following, because it may offer some degree of both comfort and forecasting, after he completes the program, how things will have changed. I'm not simply asking that your Honor direct that he get into inpatient treatment because that will come to an end at some point, as Officer Ahmed just indicated, whether 30, 60, 90, 120 days, and then the question is what then. We have proposed — and I had these discussions with Mr. Ahmed and the government weeks ago — that his conditions of release be changed as well, such that when he is not — when he finishes this program, as you say, hopefully successfully, your Honor, for a host of reasons, that he would be monitored electronically and be on, I think, home detention, such that he is not permitted to leave his parents' residence, where he's at

right now rather than the apartment that he is giving up where he used to reside in New Jersey, for the remainder of this case except in the event that he successfully gets a new job. He's certainly lost the job he had before the shutdown, in any event, for medical or for legal reasons. In other words, that there would be consequences above and beyond the program completion, such that I think — and your Honor should know, the danger, the concern, would not be present except in the most theoretical sense.

Your Honor, I have -- a day after he returned to

New York, when his family took him back from Massachusetts to

Brooklyn, to their home, I have had the family deliver to me

his driver's license, his New Jersey driver's license. I, as
an officer of the Court, have that driver's license.

I also have the only key that exists to that vehicle, and the vehicle is not in the same place as Mr. Cheedie. The vehicle is not in Brooklyn, he will have no access to that.

The reason I'm mentioning this, Judge, is I think the danger that your Honor highlighted is the combination of drinking and then getting behind the wheel of a car --

THE COURT: Right. I tend to believe that what he needs most is treatment.

Government, what is your -- and I'd be satisfied with that. What's your position on this?

MS. KEARNEY: Thank you, your Honor.

24

25

I think Officer Ahmed knows a lot more about the 1 2 effectiveness of the various programs, but if we are in 3 agreement that this residential program has a high 4 effectiveness rate, which --5 THE COURT: Has a what? 6 MS. KEARNEY: High effectiveness rate. 7 THE COURT: High effectiveness rate. Well, Mr. Ahmed doesn't know. 8 9 MS. KEARNEY: Right, which I can't really speak to. 10 Look, your Honor highlighted the concerns that the 11 government has here. This is someone who --12 THE COURT: Speak into the mic. 13 MS. KEARNEY: I apologize. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Ahmed, can you hear Ms. Kearney? 15 MR. AHMED: No, your Honor, I cannot. 16 THE COURT: Okay. What she's saying is yes. 17 Now, what else? 18 MS. KEARNEY: I apologize, your Honor. 19 So the government has the same concerns that your 20 Honor outlined at the beginning; that is, that this is a person 21 who, by my count, it's his third arrest for DUI. There's one 22 from 2008. So that's a while ago. 23 THE COURT: I didn't know that.

MS. KEARNEY: But this is clearly a problem that has

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

plagued Mr. Cheedie for some time. And, unfortunately, the

23

24

25

consequences of that problem are not personal to him. It is --1 2 THE COURT: Are you saying what I've said? 3 MS. KEARNEY: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: All right. 5 So, if the government is not disagreeing with what 6 Mr. Sosinksy has suggested, and I think is appropriate, I'm 7 happy with that. Is there anything else you wanted to add? 8 MS. KEARNEY: No, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 10 Again, I don't mean to be harsh here to either of you. 11 I just need to move forward, and we have the Curcio hearing. 12 MS. KEARNEY: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest that 13 you were cutting me off. I was thinking about whether it was 14 worth making an additional statement, and I, myself, decided it 15 was not. 16 THE COURT: All right. Fine. 17 Mr. Cheedie, what do you want to say to me, if 18 anything? You don't have to say anything at all. Anything you 19 say can be used against you. This has nothing to do with the 20 crime with which you're charged; it's an effort to get you on 21 the straight and narrow and to help everybody be protected from 22 you.

THE DEFENDANT: I desperately need treatment, and I appreciate it.

THE COURT: All right. That's what we're going to do.

In terms of the application by the pretrial services office for bail revocation, I am not going to revoke bail here for Mr. Cheedie. I am going to direct him to report, as soon as a bed is available, to --

Mr. Sosinksy, give me the name of that outfit again?

MR. SOSINSKY: It is the Geisinger Marworth, M-a-r -
THE COURT: Spell Geisinger loudly, slowly, and

clearly and the other word.

MR. SOSINSKY: Geisinger is spelled G-e-i-s-i-n-g-e-r, Marworth, M-a-r-w-o-r-t-h, Treatment Center located in Waverly, Pennsylvania, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

I'm directing Mr. Cheedie to report to that treatment center in Pennsylvania as soon as a bed is available. And if a bed is not available within the next ten days, his counsel is to notify me in writing.

He shall complete an alcohol abuse program there, for a period of at least 30 days, and it may be longer, depending upon the treatment plan recommended by that treatment center. He is directed to successfully complete their program for alcohol abuse.

Upon his successful completion, or his earlier discharge from the program for failing to complete the program, I direct him to be -- I'm adding to the conditions of his release -- home detention enforced by location monitoring

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

technology, to be determined by pretrial services. Mr. Cheedie may self-install the home monitoring unit under the direction and instruction of pretrial services.

He is directed to reside with his parents at 2021 57th Street, Brooklyn, New York, and not to relocate from that address without prior approval of pretrial services.

After his discharge, whether successful or unsuccessful, from the alcohol abuse treatment program, he must report to pretrial services in the Southern District of New York, to be fitted with the location monitoring device.

As I say, all other conditions of his release -- that is, all prior conditions -- remain in effect.

Mr. Sosinksy, does that make sense to you?

MR. SOSINSKY: It does, your Honor.

THE COURT: Government?

MS. KEARNEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That's what I am adding to his conditions of release.

Now let's turn to the Curcio hearing.

Mr. Cheedie, what's your full name?

THE DEFENDANT: Anthony Michael Cheedie.

THE COURT: How old are you?

THE DEFENDANT: Thirty-five years old.

THE COURT: How far did you go in school?

THE DEFENDANT: B.A. in business administration from

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

```
BU, Boston University.
1
               THE COURT: BU, did you say?
 2
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, Boston University.
 4
               THE COURT: In the past 24 hours, have you taken any
5
     pills, drugs, medication of any kind?
6
               THE DEFENDANT: No.
 7
               THE COURT: Are you feeling all right today?
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
 8
9
               THE COURT: Have you taken any alcoholic beverages in
10
      the last 24 hours?
11
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized
13
      for any mental illness?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized
      for alcohol abuse?
16
17
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Are you now, or have you recently been,
19
     under the care of a doctor or psychiatrist?
20
               THE DEFENDANT: No.
21
               THE COURT: Is your mind clear?
22
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
23
               THE COURT: Mr. Sosinksy, do you have any doubt about
     Mr. Cheedie's competence to proceed today with this Curcio
24
25
      hearing?
```

23

24

25

MR. SOSINSKY: No, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Ms. Kearney? 3 MS. KEARNEY: No, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: All right. I make the finding that he is 5 fully competent to proceed. 6 Now, the purpose of this proceeding, Mr. Cheedie, is 7 to review various scenarios with you and to ask you some The issue has arisen as to whether or not there is 8 9 a conflict that Mr. Sosinksy has representing you. I don't 10 know that he has a conflict, it's a potential conflict, and I 11 need to make sure that you understand what that potential 12 conflict is because it's going to be up to you to decide 13 whether or not, in light of that potential conflict, you wish 14 to continue with Mr. Sosinksy as your lawyer or whether you 15 want to find a new lawyer. And, indeed, as I go through these questions, I'm going to offer you the ability to speak with 16 17 another lawyer about this potential conflict, if that's what you want, but that will be up to you. The important thing is 18 19 that I describe to you what this possible conflict is, and to 20 make sure you understand it, and then to determine whether --21 for you to determine whether or not you want to go forward with 22 Mr. Sosinksy as your lawyer.

Do you understand the purpose of this proceeding?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, in the United States, an attorney has a responsibility to represent his client or her client to the best of his or her ability. But the obligation of that attorney is 100 percent to that client.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: That attorney has a duty of loyalty to that client, not to anybody else. Do you understand that?

THE COURT: There's also a duty of confidentiality that the lawyer has, in other words, anything you tell Mr. Sosinksy, as long as it's done in the context of his representation of you and in the context of your seeking legal advice, is confidential, and he can't tell anyone else about what you've been telling him, and he can't use anything you've been telling him in any way except in your defense.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Sosinksy has both a duty of loyalty to you, and only you, and a duty of confidentiality that arises out of his representation of you. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, it is possible that Mr. Sosinksy may have formed an attorney-client relationship with someone who's

24

25

1 a potential witness in your case. Do you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 3 THE COURT: And did you read the letter of 4 Mr. Sosinksy dated June 9, and has he discussed that issue with 5 you and told you who that potential witness is? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 THE DEFENDANT: Thoroughly. 9 THE COURT: Now, if, in fact, Mr. Sosinksy had an 10 attorney-client relationship with the person I'll call the 11 potential witness in your case, he couldn't use anything that 12 would be harmful to that potential witness, because, in this 13 scenario, he was -- the potential witness was a client of 14 Mr. Sosinksy. 15 Do you understand that? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Either way, Mr. Sosinksy has taken the 18 position that he never had an attorney-client relationship with 19 that other witness, that potential witness. Do you understand 20 that? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 22 THE COURT: So, what the government is talking about 23 is a scenario if, indeed, he did form an attorney-client

relationship with that witness. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

THE COURT: So, if he knows something from that potential witness that would be helpful to you, and if that potential witness was his client, then he couldn't use that in any way to help you, because he's bound to the loyalty duty and confidentiality duty to that other witness.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that's the essence of the conflict; he couldn't help you, to the extent that he would be obligated to, if he had a conflicting duty of loyalty and confidentiality to the potential witness, not you.

Understood?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Even if Mr. Sosinksy had ended his attorney-client relationship with that witness -- and, remember, he believes he never formed such a relationship -- he still couldn't use anything that potential witness said to help you.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Now, I can't tell you every potential way that that potential conflict could arise, just because I don't know what's going to happen in this case, but it may be that this potential witness has told Mr. Sosinksy something he could use

in questioning some other witness, if he learned it from that potential witness, he couldn't use it, and, therefore, it wouldn't help you.

Understood?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm trying to think of things where this might arise. Mr. Sosinksy may want to cross-examine somebody in your defense, but he couldn't use something that other potential witness told him in that cross-examination, even if it would help you and would present a real problem here.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: It may even -- and, again, I'm making things up. It may even be that there might be a witness that Mr. Sosinksy would want to call, but he knows that that, in some way, would hurt you due to information he learned from the potential witness we're talking about. So he couldn't call that other witness.

Make sense?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

So I can't foresee all the ways in which that potential conflict may arise that's a part of the issue here.

Part of what I have to do, Mr. Cheedie, is to make sure you understand what this potential conflict is. So, would

you tell me, in your own words, what you think I'm blathering on about; that is, what the potential conflict is? I want to make sure you understand.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay, your Honor. Beyond obviously speaking to Mr. Sosinksy, I've also been conversing with Mr. Sarikas.

THE COURT: Who is also a lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: That's the reason I brought him on as counsel, to eliminate that conflict of interest, if there is any. Also, the slight chance that we do go to trial, and if he needs to be interviewed or cross-examined, the point of having Mr. Sarikas is to solely deal with that potential witness.

THE COURT: Oh, I didn't realize that. That certainly helps. That does, indeed.

THE DEFENDANT: I've also conversed with Attorney

Donald Yannella, who is counsel for me with my situation in New

Jersey, and I covered it with him on the basis, as well, of how

I would be using a separate attorney to separate, again, the

conflict of interest.

THE COURT: Mr. Sosinksy, is your co-counsel in your firm or anything like that?

MR. SOSINSKY: No, he's independent of my firm. We've known each other as colleagues for quite some time. That's all.

THE COURT: All right, fine.

Go ahead, Mr. Cheedie, so what's the potential conflict? And I'm glad you have spoken with other counsel. Go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I understand the potential conflict is if we were to potentially go to trial, and the witness — the potential witness was to need to be cross-examined by my counsel, we would actually eliminate Mr. Sosinksy from dealing with that altogether.

THE COURT: Why?

THE DEFENDANT: Because of the information that -when they had that meeting back in early or mid-2019, any
information that was provided to Mr. Sosinksy during that
meeting cannot be used in the court of law.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, you want me to appoint another attorney to discuss this conflict with you? It sounds like you've spoken to people already.

THE DEFENDANT: It's not necessary, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Because I'm prepared to do that if you want.

THE DEFENDANT: No, thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, do you also understand that if you do decide that you want Mr. Sosinksy to continue to represent you, you can't, in the future, argue that Mr. Sosinksy did not represent you

adequately because he had this conflict?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that's the reason we're here, I understand.

THE COURT: All right.

So, what is your pleasure, sir? Do you want

Mr. Sosinksy to continue to represent you in connection with
the charges against you in this indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: I would love for him to continue to represent me, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I do make the finding that Mr. Cheedie has knowingly and voluntarily chosen Mr. Sosinksy to serve as his attorney here and that he has waived his right to conflict-free representation.

All right. Mr. Cheedie, thank you. You've satisfied me that you're intelligent, you understand this, you're articulate. I don't know why you're getting into trouble with alcohol, but maybe somebody can -- maybe you'll understand that after this treatment. It makes absolutely no sense for alcohol to be erecting barriers in your life professionally. I assume there have been problems personally. It just makes no sense. So, try to get a hold of it. Actually, do more than try to get a hold of that problem, take hold of that problem and conquer it, and you will be a lot better off.

Do you understand that?

25

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. I will, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: In some way, getting your alcohol problems 3 or your ability to -- your willingness to go to alcohol 4 treatment has saved you from my revoking your bail and sending 5 you to jail, but, on the other hand, if you didn't have the 6 alcohol problem, you probably wouldn't be here, in the first 7 place, so get rid of that problem. You understand? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I will, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: For your sake, and the sake of your case 11 here, and the sake of your future happiness. 12 Anything else that I can do for the government? 13 MS. KEARNEY: No, your Honor. Thank you very much. THE COURT: Anything else I can do for the defense? 14 15 MR. SOSINSKY: No, your Honor. Thank you very much 16 for having us. 17 THE COURT: And we have another date in this case, as 18 I remember. We had a telephone conference last week. 19 MS. KEARNEY: We do, and I don't know it off the top 20 of my head. 21 THE COURT: I couldn't hear you. 22 MS. KEARNEY: I said we do, and I don't know it off 23 the top of my head. 24 THE COURT: Thank you, all, I appreciate it.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

appreciate all the people in the back coming in support of

Mr. Cheedie, especially in this very difficult time for everyone. Stay safe, everyone. MR. SOSINSKY: Thank you, your Honor. MR. AHMED: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Oh, Mr. Ahmed, thank you for appearing by phone. MR. AHMED: I would like to thank you for allowing me to appear telephonically, and I apologize for any inconvenience that may have caused any of the parties. THE COURT: No inconvenience at all. Stay safe, sir. MR. AHMED: Thank you, sir.